District Response Article 9 Evaluation

May 23, 2023

9.A.3. Student Evaluations

3. Student Surveys~~Evaluations~~ Student surveys ~~evaluation~~ shall be a part of every evaluation of every classroom instructor except as provided in 9.A.3.7 below~~Not~~ every class ~~need~~ needs to be surveyed, unless the evaluatee or the evaluators so request. Student surveys may also be conducted for non classroom faculty~~Non-classroom faculty may also be so evaluated~~, provided that the members of the department determine that student evaluation is appropriate.

   3.1. Student surveys ~~questionnaires~~ shall be uniform, to the extent possible, for all classroom faculty.

   3.2. Student surveys shall be distributed to students – Š " ' — ‰ Š – Š ‡ ' Ž Ž ‡ ‰ ‡ ï •   ‡ ƒ Management System ~~in a fashion that is appropriate to the format of the class and the student population, as determined by the department~~

   3.~~2~~3. The distribution and gathering of the student survey ~~evaluation~~ forms shall not be done by the evaluatee.

   3.~~3~~4. Completed student surveys ~~questionnaires~~ and computer printed summaries shall be forwarded to the evaluators who shall prepare appropriate summaries of the results. The summaries shall become part of the evaluation report.

   3.~~4~~5. Completed student surveys ~~questionnaires~~ may be viewed by the evaluatee ' • Ž › ƒ ˆ – ‡ " – Š ‡ ‡ ˜ ƒ Ž — ƒ – ‡ ‡ ï •   ˆ ‹ • ƒ Ž ‰ " ƒ † ‡ • Š ƒ ˜ ‡ „ ‡ ‡ • – — " •

   3.~~5~~6. Non-classroom disciplines/departments may develop student survey ~~evaluation~~ forms subject to approval by the Union and the District.

   3.7. Student surveys will not be required in certain ~~courses, such as~~ low-level noncredit ESL ~~or~~ and noncredit DSPS ~~courses, if~~ where the department determines that they are not appropriate. Where a department makes this determination, it should be consistent for all sections of the given course for the academic year

---

By End of Week 1:

2.1.2. The Department Chairperson shall select two or three peer evaluators, ~~in consultation with the~~ with the approval of the supervising Dean. The team shall ordinarily consist of three members but may be reduced to two based on departmental workload. Wherever possible, teams shall represent the diversity of California and be sensitive to affirmative action concerns (Ed. Code §87663(d) and see also Article 4). Where possible, the evaluators shall be from the same or a related department as the evaluatee. The evaluatee may elect to have one of the evaluators be from another discipline or department, with the Department Chair and supervising Dean having final authority ~~in consultation with the Dean~~ to designate the specific evaluator from another discipline or department. The evaluatee shall have the right, within three working days of receipt of the notification, without stating cause, to make up to three (3) disqualifications, in writing, from those originally selected. The evaluators shall not be notified until the ~~challenge~~ disqualification period has passed. The Department Chairperson and supervising Dean shall ~~recommend~~ identify a chair for the evaluating team. The chair of the evaluating team shall have the responsibility of facilitating the evaluation process and obtaining proper signatures, when necessary.

2.1.2.2. Except as provided in this section (9.B.2.1.2.2), the two (2) member evaluation team shall follow the same evaluation procedures as a three (3) member team.

In the event that the two (2) member evaluation team is unable to agree on the overall evaluation rating, the evaluators will endeavor to reach a consensus in consultation with the Department Chairperson or if the Department Chairperson is on the committee, the supervising Dean ~~the Dean responsible for faculty evaluation~~. In their attempt to reach consensus, the evaluators may, if time allows, conduct a second classroom or work site ~~visitation~~ observation(s). Thereafter, if the evaluators are unable to reach a consensus evaluation, the evaluation will be deemed incomplete. The evaluatee will undergo peer evaluation by a three-person team in the following semester, no member of which shall have served on the previous two (2) member evaluation team.

2.1.6. Consistent with the Evaluation Calendar, Section 9.A.4, above, ~~at~~ at least one (1) week before the first classroom/work site ~~evaluation visit~~ observation, the evaluators shall confer individually or collectively with the evaluatee, and the evaluators shall also confer individually or collectively with the evaluatee within two (2) weeks after the classroom/work site ~~evaluation visit~~ observation has occurred. The evaluators shall decide as a committee whether the conferences shall be with the entire committee or individually.

2.1.7. Within two (2) working days after the formal classroom or work site ~~visitation~~ observation(s), the evaluatee shall have the option of having the evaluators repeat the classroom or work site visitation(s).

2.1.8. If the evaluators anticipate writing an unsatisfactory evaluation report, the evaluators shall so inform the evaluatee in writing ~~at the post-evaluation conference~~. The evaluators shall repeat the classroom or work site ~~visitation~~ observation(s) within ten (10) working days after informing the evaluatee ~~the post-evaluation conference~~ If the reason for the unsatisfactory report is not classroom or worksite related, the second ~~visitation~~ observation is not necessary. If, as a result of the second ~~visitation~~ observation(s), the evaluati 1 221o-3(g)-5( )-8(a)9(n)-3( )-8(u)-10(n)-3(s)-(n

2.3.5. After reviewing the self-evaluation, student evaluations (if used), and supporting documents (if used), the evaluating team may recommend evaluation under Section 9.D by turning in to the Associate Vice Chancellor the evaluation report with written rationale for recommending re-evaluation. The peer committee evaluators shall use an

or it may choose to function as a committee-of-the-whole, provided that the committee-of-the- whole has at least three faculty members,

District Proposal t Articl78osP

6.2.1. Where the first year contract employee has served as a full-time temporary academic employee (LTS), or a full-time grant/ categorical employee for the complete academic year prior to ~~his/her~~ their appointment as a contract employee, the previous year ~~shall be counted as the first~~ year of contract employment in accord with Education Code §§ 87478 and 87470. For purposes of tenure review, the two semesters of temporary or grant/categorical full-time employment shall ~~be counted as the fifth and sixth semesters and consequently~~ be counted in lieu of the fifth and sixth semesters of tenure review

6.2.2. Where a full-time contract employee is appointed in the spring semester and serves in the previous semester as a full-time temporary or grant/categorical full-time employee, this academic year constitutes ~~the first~~ a year of contract employment, counted in lieu of the fifth and sixth semesters of tenure review.

9.G.7. Due Process and Tenure Review Grievances

9.G.7.3.1 The immediate supervisor will appoint a new Tenure Review Committee, including ~~himself/herself~~ themselves and the chair of the previous committee. Other members would be new. Ethnic and gender identity non-uniformity would be maintained. The new Committee would have five members in all cases. The new Committee will elect its chair from among the faculty members on the Committee. The chair may or may not be the chair of the previous Committee. If tenure review has been done by a committee-of-the-whole, the new members of the Committee will be chosen from the related disciplines as described in Section 9.G.2.2.1.

9.G.7.3.1.2 The employee will be invited to recast ~~his/her~~ their Tenure Portfolio. The Committee will review all of the documents from the old Committee. If the employee is currently employed by the District, the Committee for reconsideration will carry out a one-semester evaluation including a complete visitation and student evaluation process. Compensation shall be in accordance with Section 9.4.

9.G.9. Tenure Service Requirement

9.G.9.2.2 The District determines that the faculty member has demonstrated sufficient progress in ~~his/her~~ their ability to perform the assigned duties and professional responsibilities of a tenured, full-time faculty member despite ~~his/her~~ their absence from work.

Credit Online Classes

1. Does the instructor organize the material well?
2. • – Š ‡ ‹••–"— … – '"ï• '"‡•‡•–ƒ–‹• '^ •ƒ–‡"‹ƒŽ …Ž‡ƒ" ƒ•† —•†‡"•–ƒ•†ƒ
3. Does the instructor seem to have adequate knowledge of the subject area of this course?
4. When possible, does the instructor relate subject matter to other fields and situations?
5. Does the instructor respect your efforts and opinions as an individual?
6. Does the instructor try to interest you in the subject and encourage you to learn more about it?
7. Were your responsibilities in the course (exams, term papers, participation requirements, etc.) clearly stated and explained?
8. Is the grading system fair?
9. Does the instructor follow his/her stated grading system?
10. Are the methods of testing (examinations, papers, etc.) a valid evaluation of the knowledge and or skills you have gained from this course?
11. Is the instructor sufficiently available to you during the semester?
12. Are assignments relevant and helpful in understanding the subject area?
13. Is the instructor receptive to questions from students?
14. Does the instructor respond to student inquiries in a timely manner?
15. Is the instructor enthusiastic about teaching this course?
16. Does the instructor make your exam and assignment results available promptly with meaningful feedback?
17. Does the instructor communicate clearly and understandably?
18. Does the instructor ~~show respect for all racial, sexual, religious, and political groups~~ seem to be free of racial, sexual, religious, and political prejudices?
19. What is your overall evaluation of this instructor?
20. If you wish to add any comments concerning your instructor, please write them below.

Questions 1 s z ƒ"‡ '• ƒ Sometimes ‡˜‡"ó''w•– •…ƒŽ‡‡á ™‹–Š ƒ• ò †'•ï– ••'™ó ''– —‡•–‹• s{ ‹• '• ƒ ò•ƒ̃—…Ž̃– point scale. Question 20 is for open comments.

Lower-Level Credit ESL Classes

1. The teacher explains English well.
2. The teacher respects the students.
3. The lesson is organized.
4. The ~~books and~~instructional materials help me learn English.
5. The teacher helps me understand my mistakes.
6. The teacher encourages students to ask questions.
7. The teacher gives time for questions.
8. The teacher answers questions well.
9. The directions for assignments are clear.
10. The teacher returns my work quickly.
11. The grading system is clear and understandable.
12. The teacher starts the class on time.
13. The teacher ends the class on time.
14. The teacher uses class time well.
15. The teacher likes to teach.
16. The teacher speaks clearly.
17. The teacher is available and helpful in office hours or at other times.
18. What else would you like to say about the teacher? Please write your comments below.

Questions 1-17 ƒ " ‡ ' • ƒ ò -Šô™ǧ†mes ‡ ˜ ‡ " ǿ' 'w•– •… ƒ Ž ‡ á ™ ‹ – Š ƒ • ò † ' • ï – • •' ™ ó '' – Question 18 is for open comments.

This questionnaire is used for the following credit ESL classes. Other credit ESL classes use the Credit questionnaire.

Course	Title
ESL 49	Pronunciation
ESL 75	Intermediate Editing and Grammar Review
ESL 75A	Intermediate Editing and Grammar Review A
ESL 75B	Intermediate Editing and Grammar Review B
ESL 75C	Intermediate Editing and Grammar Review C
ESL182	Intermediate Academic ESL

Noncredit DSPS Classes

1. The teacher explains the purpose of the class well.

2. The teacher respects the students.

3. The lesson is organized.

4. The teacher gives me clear instructions

5. The teacher helps me understand my mistakes.

6. The teacher gives time for questions.

7. The teacher answers questions well.

8. The teacher helps me to improve.

9. The teacher starts the class on time.

10. The teacher ends the class on time.

11. The teacher uses class time well.

12. The teacher likes to teach.

13. You can write more about your teacher here.

This form is used for all noncredit DSPS classes, except for DSPS 4305 (High School Level Learning Strategies). Students in DSPS 4305 would use the same form used in other noncredit courses.

Credit DSPS courses use the credit course form.

Librarians

1. Was the presentation well organized?
2. Did the Library instructor seem to have adequate knowledge of research skills?
3. Did the library instructor use examples and illustrations effectively?
4. Did the library instructor speak clearly and understandably?
5. Did the library instructor try to answer questions from students during or after the workshop?
6. Did the library instructor show interest and enthusiasm in teaching the class?
7. Did the library instructor seem to be free of racial, sexual, religious and political prejudices?
8. Was this workshop useful and relevant to your academic needs?
9. Do you now feel more confident about using the library resources taught in this class?
10. What is your overall evaluation of this library instructor?
11. If you wish to add any comments about your instructor, please write them below.

Questions 1 { ƒ " ‡ ' • ƒ ò-Sometimes ‡ ˜ ‡ " ó' 'w• — • … ƒ Ž ‡ á ™ ‹ – Š ƒ • ò † ' • ï — • • ' ™ ó ' ' – ‹ s r ‹ • ' • ƒ • ò š . • ‡ ƒ Ž ‡ • ƒ … -point scale. Question 11 is for open comments.